Receptive Aesthetic Criteria : Reader Comparisons of Two Finnish Translations of Hamlet

Keinänen, Nely Mary

2018

Keinänen , N M 2018 , ' Receptive Aesthetic Criteria : Reader Comparisons of Two Finnish Translations of Hamlet ' , Multicultural Shakespeare , vol. 18 , no. 33 , pp. 23-42 . https://doi.org/10.18778/2083-8530

http://hdl.handle.net/10138/297714
https://doi.org/10.18778/2083-8530.18.03

Multicultural Shakespeare: Translation, Appropriation and Performance
vol. 18 (33), 2018; DOI: 10.18778/2083-8530.18.03

Nely Keinänen*

Receptive Aesthetic Criteria: Reader Comparisons of Two Finnish Translations of *Hamlet*

Abstract: This article examines the subjective aesthetic criteria used to assess two Finnish translations of *Hamlet*, one by Eeva-Liisa Manner (1981) and the other by Matti Rossi (2013), both accomplished translators for the stage. A survey consisting of one general question ("Briefly describe your idea of how Shakespeare translation should sound in Finnish, and what you think are the qualities of a good Shakespeare translation") and five text extracts was distributed on paper and electronically, generating 50 responses. For the extracts, respondents were asked whether one or the other translation most closely dorresponded to their idea of what a Shakespeare translation should sound like and why, along with questions on whether they would prefer to see or read one or the other. The results show that there are no strong shared expectancy norms in Finland regarding Shakespeare translation. Manner was generally felt to be more concise and poetic, while Rossi was praised for his exquisite use of modern Finnish. Respondents agreed that rhythm was an important criterion, but disagreed on what sorts of rhythms they preferred. Translation of the "to be or not to be" speech raised the most passions, with many strongly preferring Manner's more traditional translation. The results suggest that Shakespeare scholars would do well to take variations in expectancy norms into account when assessing and analysing Shakespeare in translation.

Keywords: Shakespeare reception, translation, drama translation, Hamlet, Shakespeare in Finland, Matti Rossi, Eeva-Liisa Manner.

In Daniel Gallimore's stimulating recent article in *Multicultural Shakespeare*, he speaks of the Japanese translator Tsubouchi Shōyō's efforts to translate Shakespeare into "beautiful Japanese" (Gallimore, Shōyō 72). In Gallimore's analysis, beauty often seems to come down to rhythm, effective use of sound devices such as alliteration and diphthongs, and effective contrasts of an "elegant" and "jagged" style (Gallimore, Shōyō 80). In this article, I am less concerned with any absolute markers of "beauty" but rather in the subjective

* University of Helsinki, Finland.

responses of actual readers to translated excerpts of Shakespeare. What, in their opinion, are the features and qualities of a successful Shakespeare translation into Finnish? I got the idea for this study when interviewing Finnish theatrical directors about how they go about choosing a translation for performance. I was struck by their varying criteria: one looked for verbs, another cared more for what "sounds good." Because such aesthetic criteria vary by individual, and also over time, I decided to try to identify some of the main criteria modern Finnish readers use to judge Shakespeare translations. As evidence, I selected two *Hamlet* modern translations into Finnish: Eeva-Liisa Manner's (1981) and Matti Rossi's (2013). Manner's translation was initially commissioned by the Tampere Theatre, and continues to be one of the most performed texts of *Hamlet* in Finland today. Rossi's translation was commissioned by WSOY, a leading Finnish publishing company as the final play in its complete works translation project. Rossi was the major translator in this project, translating 16 of 38 plays, and is particularly known for his politically-charged Shakespeare translations of the 1960s, a time when Shakespeare performance was undergoing radical transformation.[1] These are among the best of the translations of *Hamlet* currently available in Finnish.

Both Manner and Rossi are accomplished poets, and their *Hamlet* translations are dynamic and speakable, displaying superb command of rhythm and verse, effective use of sound devices, and creative solutions to translating Shakespeare's imagery. In other respects, however, the two translations are different: Manner's is more compact and somehow angrier, while Rossi's is fuller, more lyrical, luxuriating in the abundant feast of Shakespeare's language. In bringing these two texts together, I seek not to claim that one is better than the other, but rather to use them to examine the subjective criteria by which Shakespeare translations are assessed in modern Finland. In addition, I am curious whether there are differences in the features deemed vital for texts written to be read or performed. While these results may not be immediately applicable to translators and theatre practitioners in other languages and cultures, I hope that they nevertheless shed light on ways that aesthetic and stylistic criteria are discussed and evaluated, while also providing comparative analyses of two translations into Finnish of the same excerpts.

To date, neither translation nor Shakespeare scholars have much compared audience reactions to side-by-side translations. As a historical, classic text, Shakespeare puts heavy demands on the translator, not only due to the inherent difficulty of the language but also due to the pressures and expectations created by previous translations. Translation theorists are well aware of the often contradictory expectations audiences bring to texts. Speaking of re-translation, Lawrence Venuti comments:

[1] For a description of the WSOY Complete Works translation project, see Keinänen.

> A translation may be judged unacceptable by readerships who possess the information that the translator lacked, who value the literary canon or translation tradition that the translator unwittingly challenged, who interpret the foreign text differently from the translator, or who are alienated by the publisher's practices. If the translator succeeds in appealing to an intended audience, the translation may nonetheless be read by a different audience who finds it unacceptable. (29)[2]

Shakespeare scholar Alexa Huang describes literary translation as a "love affair involving two equal partners" (86), a metaphor which in some ways is also applicable to the relationship between translators and their readers. As in love, however, different readers are attracted to different types of translations.

There has been little previous work specifically on readers' expectations of translations in Finland.[3] Within the field of translation studies, reception theory and norm theory seem to offer the most fruitful avenues for exploring audience responses. Reception theory examines "the way a work conforms to, challenges or disappoints the readers' aesthetic 'horizon of expectation,'" a term used by Jauss to "refer to readers' general expectations (of the style, form, content, etc) of the genre or series to which the new work belongs" (Munday 154). But the major aspects of productive aesthetic experience identified by Jauss--*poiesis*, *aisthesis* and *catharsis*—seem to be very far removed from a reader's physical response to the sounds and rhythms of a poetic text, a point Gallimore also raises in connection with Shōyō's translations as challenging the voices and bodies of the actors asked to perform them (Gallimore, Shōyō 84).

---

[2] Theories of retranslation do not seem relevant for this analysis, which focuses on reader's expectations in the present moment and not the social, literary and cultural contexts in effect when the translations were done. Rossi is familiar with re-translation for he had earlier reworked some of his own translations. For example, in 1972 he did his first translation of *Macbeth* for a specific theater production, where the speech was quite colloquial. He reworked this translation for another production ten years later, and again in 1997 for a production by the director Kama Ginkas. Ginkas wanted a specific type of unbroken meter, and apparently refused to accept anything else. Rossi's text was later reworked by the Finnish director Jotaarkka Pennanen, for a production in 2002 (Aaltonen 2003 155). For a detailed look at the history of retranslation in Finland, see (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015).

[3] In studying translations of Dorothy L. Sayers's novels into Finnish in the 1940s and 1980s, Minna Ruokonen identifies general qualities of a good translation: natural and fluent Finnish, a lucid and coherent text which is unabridged and conveys the style (Ruokonen 80). Tiina Puurtinen compares the readability of two translations of *The Wizard of Oz* into Finnish, where she asks two cohorts of 9-10 year-olds to complete a cloze test, finding that students did significantly better on the translation with simpler sentence structures (Puurtinen).

Somewhat similar to Jauss' "horizon of expectations" is the idea of "expectancy norms," which are "established by the expectations of readers of a translation (of a given type) concerning what a translation (of this type) should be like (Chesterman, Memes 64). Most importantly, "expectancy norms. . . are not static or permanent, nor are they monolithic. They are highly sensitive to text type. . . and they are open to modification and change" (Chesterman, Memes 67).[4] Translation norms seem to be somewhat circular, as the practices of translators deemed competent can then affect later translations. In the case of Finnish Shakespeare, for example, Alice Martin has discussed how other translators in the WSOY complete works translation project began to adopt the methods of handling verse and meter which Rossi used in his own early translations (76). Nestori Siponkoski has also analysed the WSOY translation project, focusing on the interplay between copyeditors and translators in four volumes of the series. Although Siponkoski is mainly interested in the extent to which the translators adopt the suggestions offered by copyeditors, isolated examples reveal some of the expectancy norms of these editors: e.g. preferring some archaic expressions rather than modern ones (Siponkoski 123,153,169), and preferring solutions considered more poetic in terms of their sound qualities (144) and rhythm (154-57, 170, 171). But even the concept of norms seems problematic for explaining what is essentially a combined physical and intellectual response to a text. Do bodies react in normative ways to poetry?

Before introducing my survey, I want to return to the question of the initial translation brief: Manner was translating directly for the stage while Rossi for the page, and so in this sense his translation is much less targeted than Manner's, a difference which might be expected to affect the translation strategies. According to Aaltonen, "loosely targeted (re)translations are not likely to highlight any particular thematic reading of their source text but rather encourage the perception of it as an open text. Their expected life span is long" (147). Loosely targeted translations are generally "used to integrate foreign texts into the indigenous stock as cultural capital" (148), and indeed WSOY emphasized throughout the project the cultural impact of re-translating Shakespeare's plays. The translator's brief provided by the publisher, however, placed very few limitations on the translators: they were asked to be "loyal" to the original text, which in most cases was the Oxford and Arden Shakespeares; nothing was to be added or omitted; and prose/verse distinctions were to be

[4] "Norms" might not be the best tool with which to discuss literary translation, as Andrew Chesterman notes in predicting "norms of the future": "Curiously, there seems to be one exception to most of the predictions I will propose. This is literary translation. I think this will continue much as it has always been done" (Chesterman, Norms 2). It is also fair to ask whether these extracts were long enough and different enough to elicit information on perceived norms, though it is unlikely that more data would significantly change the results.

observed (Martin 76). Regarding Manninen's translation brief, it seems likely that she was asked to shorten the text for performance, as her translation is shorter and more compact than Rossi's, a fact that several respondents commented upon, some approvingly and some not. Despite these outward differences in translation brief, given Rossi's long history of translating Shakespeare for the stage, I think it is fair to assume that differences in their translations are due more to the translators' own instincts and strategies rather than the translation brief per se.

A Reader Survey of Excerpts from Two *Hamlets*

In an effort to understand the ways readers perceive differences between translations, I put together a survey asking respondents to compare five extracts from each translation. The survey was in Finnish, and was piloted during a public lecture I gave on Shakespeare translation in Finland (March 11, 2015, 19 respondents). An electronic version was available for a few weeks in Spring, 2015, which was distributed through Facebook and University of Helsinki mailing lists (31 respondents). Because the survey did not change between the pilot and electronic versions, I have conflated the results. Of the 50 total participants, 43 were female and 7 were male.[5] The majority of participants were 20-29 years of age (22), with others as follows: 30-39 (8); 40-49 (7); 50-59 (8); 60-69 (3), 70+ (2). Given the low number of responses I have also not correlated with age, but with a larger sample it might be interesting to test whether older participants differ in any important way from the 20-29 year-olds. The vast majority (45) speak Finnish as their mother tongue, with one additional reporting being bilingual in Finnish/English. Two marked Swedish as their mother tongue and one marked English.

Four questions were asked about each pair of extracts: 1) Does one of the texts more closely corresponded to your idea of what a Shakespeare translation should sound like and why; 2) Describe each extract in a few adjectives; 3) Which text would you rather see performed, and why; and 4) Which text would you rather read, and why. The extracts were presented in a random order (so one of the texts was not always "A" or "B"). Respondents were told that the texts were all from *Hamlet* but were not given the names of the translators.

The survey began with a general question: "Briefly describe your idea of how Shakespeare translation should sound in Finnish, and what you think are the

[5] Given the small number of male participants, meaningful comparisons cannot be made between the genders, though it is worth asking why so many more women were inspired to answer such a survey rather than men.

qualities of a good Shakespeare translation." Before assessing the extracts, I wanted the respondents to think about their general aesthetic and other criteria of a successful Shakespeare translation. Not surprisingly, there are almost as many responses as there were participants. Nevertheless, some themes did emerge. The most discussed issue was whether the language should be old-fashioned, modern, or something in between, akin to what David Johnston discusses as the process of "extending the foreign play to another theatre system, while at the same time enabling it to speak vividly of its own different context" (19). Speaking of modern translations of classical drama, Hardwick makes a similar point:

> The focus of productions has shifted towards the creation of production dynamics which *both* make it appear that the production has been created in the language in which it is spoken/acted *and* which seek to communicate to the audience, which may have little or no knowledge of ancient theatre, an intellectual and emotional experience which corresponds to that attributed to the original (174).

In this vein, almost half of my respondents (20) thought the language should be "old." Two thought it should "not be too old," and four thought it should not be "too modern." One of these explicitly said that modern Finnish spoken language (which differs a great deal from written language) should "under no circumstances be used." Only one said Shakespeare translation should "reveal the historical period" and four mentioned the need to be faithful to social distinctions evident in the historical material. Many of those who wished that the language of the translation could somehow reflect the age of the original nevertheless added that the translation should be "easy to understand," which was another leading category, mentioned by 14 respondents. One added that the text should be understandable but "not too simple." I will return to other qualities of the target language below.

A particular problem with Shakespeare translation is what to do with the metrical verse, and again historical changes in literary styles and tastes will affect the translation strategy chosen. For example, the Japanese translator Kinoshita Junji "fears that Shakespeare translation in an arcane, metrical style may sound like parody to modern ears" so he opts for "colloquial, unrhythmical language" (Gallimore, History 96). Differences in the rhythms of Finnish and English make these choices particularly difficult for translators, given that reproducing Shakespeare's iambic pentameter in an essentially trochaic language is well-nigh impossible.[6] Among my respondents, too, after age and

[6] Most Finnish translators choose to work within the natural trochaic rhythms of Finnish, but a few attempt iambic pentameter. See Keinänen.

clarity, the next most mentioned theme was connected to poetic and lyrical qualities, mentioned by nineteen in one way or another. Of these eight thought the translation should be "faithful to the rhythm and meter" of the original, with another three saying that verse should be translated as verse. Two, by contrast, said there was no need to be faithful to poetic form or meter. Related to poetic qualities are the four who said translations should be "faithful to the original style" or "the original qualities of the text." Several said translations should be "light, fluent, natural" (7) or "flowing" (6). A number of respondents (5) mentioned the sonorous qualities of language, with one commenting that ideally a translation would produce "physical pleasure when spoken, just as when reading aloud [the Finnish poet] Eino Leino."

Many respondents wished that translations would capture the nuances of Shakespeare's language. For example, six mention the importance of wordplay, and four mention humour. "Imagery" was mentioned by two. Respondents hoped translators would capture the "richness" (4), "energy and drama" (4), "density" (1), and "theatricality" (1) of Shakespeare's language. Surprisingly few mention fidelity to content (6) or atmosphere/feeling (5).[7]

Many respondents talked about the qualities of *Finnish* they would like to see in Shakespeare translations. As discussed above, the most mentioned quality was "easy to understand." Seven mentioned that the texts should be in good Finnish, "light, fluent and natural." A related concept was "flowing," mentioned by six. One mentioned that translators should take advantage of the qualities of Finnish, specifically its wide vocabulary. Although Shakespeare scholars tend to focus on the beauty of Shakespeare's language, this quality was only mentioned specifically by three in this section, though the concept of beauty came up in discussions of the excerpts. Other adjectives used include "colourful" (2), "memorable" (1), "classic" (1), "sophisticated" (1), and "strong" (1). A few made reference to what might be considered the qualities of translators as well as their translations, such as "creative" (2) and "inventive" (2). One hoped that the translation would be "insightful," help her understand the text in a new way. As you can see, a fairly wide range of criteria were offered as being important for Shakespeare translation, but there was also some disagreement, e.g. over the necessity of fidelity to form, or the preservation of historical, older qualities of language. Table 1 presents these results organized by theme.

[7] C.f. Leppihalme, who in her analysis of a Finnish translation of David Mamet's *Oleanna* found that sticking too closely to the source text can weaken the effect of the target text: "a misguided attempt to respect the *language* of a famous dramatist thus led to a translation that did less than justice to his *text*" (160).

Table 1: Briefly describe your idea of how Shakespeare translation should sound in Finnish, and what you think are the qualities of a good Shakespeare translation.

Old-fashioned vs. modern language prefer old-fashioned, 20 not too old, 2 not too modern, 4 faithful to social distinctions and dialects of older English, 4
Fidelity to Style faithful to original style, 4 faithful to rhythm and meter/verse, 11 no need to be faithful to meter, 2 poetic and lyrical, 19 reproduce sonorous qualities of language, 5 richness of language, 4 energy and drama of language, 4 density of language, 1 theatricality of language, 1 Fidelity to Content wordplay, 6 humour, 4 imagery, 2 fidelity to content, 6 Fidelity to atmosphere, 5
Qualities of Target Language intelligible, easy to understand – 14 (often presented in opposition to "old" language) light, fluent, natural, 7 flowing, 6 colourful, 2 memorable, 1 classic, 1 sophisticated, 1 strong, 1 beautiful, 3
Qualities of Translator/Translation insightful, 1 creative, 2 inventive, 2

I will next present the five extracts, with key points in italics or bold, and the Finnish translations followed by back translations into English, commenting on the main findings from each. For ease of reference, I am placing Manner's text first, but am maintaining the original A and B markings so the reader can see the order in which they were presented on the survey.

Text 1 is one of the most interesting, as this was the one which most clearly divided the respondents and also which most clearly captures some of the main differences between the translations. In response to the question of which text more closely corresponds to their idea of a good Shakespeare translation, fully 70% said Manner, with 22% citing Rossi, with a handful saying both (4%) or expressing no opinion. Respondents who preferred Manner commented mainly on its poetic qualities, calling it "beautiful," whereas those who preferred Rossi found it easier to understand, thought it would be easier for a modern actor to speak, and therefore more believable onstage. The key features here for readers seem to be compactness, inverted syntax, softer alliteration, and the absence of too-prosaic sounding expressions.

Text 1 Hamlet, 1.2.129-34

	A. (Manner)	B. (Rossi)
O that this too too sullied flesh would melt, /	Voi miksei tämä inhon tiukka liha / Oh why can't this disgusting tight flesh	Miksi tämä liian tiivis liha *ei jo sula kastepisaroiksi*!/ Why does this too solid flesh not melt into dew drops?
Thaw, and resolve itself into a dew,/	*hajota voi ja haihtua kuin kaste?* / dissolve and evaporate like dew?	
Or that the Everlasting had not fixed /	Voi miksei Kaikkivallan laki salli / Oh why does not the Almighty's law allow	Miksi Jumalamme ikuisessa laissaan kieltää **itsemurhan**!/ Why does our God in his eternal law forbid suicide?
His canon 'gainst self-slaughter. O God, God, /	ihmisen itse **päättää päiviään**? a person to end one's days? Jumala, Jumala, <u>olen uupunut,</u> / God, God, I am weary	

How weary, stale, flat and unprofitable /	Miten joutavalta tuntuu kaikki / How useless everything feels	Hyvä Luoja, miten ikäviä, tunkkaisia,/ ahdistavia ja turhanpäiväisiä ovat / Good Lord, how deplorable, stale, oppressive and trivial are
Seem to me all the uses of this world!	Ja *meno maailman* on turha, turha! And the way of the world is useless, useless	tämän maailman tavat! Iljettävää,/ iljettävää! the ways of this world! revolting, / revolting!

So what makes this text more "poetic"? Perhaps the first thing to notice is the compactness of A versus B, both in terms of the average number of syllables per line (10.5 vs 15.2) and the number of syllables per word. In this short sequence, Manner has two words of four syllables and seven of three syllables, with most of the words being one or two syllables. Rossi, by contrast, has two six-syllable words, one five-syllable word, and six four-syllable words, with most of the rest being two.

Manner is also more "poetic" in the sense of having unusual syntax and word order, as seen in the italicized sections, where *hajota voi ja haihtua* reverses normal word order in order to emphasize the alliteration and assonance on *hajota* ("dissolve") and *haihtua* ("evaporate"). A second example comes at the end of the passage, with the poetic inversion of the usual phrase *maailman meno* into *meno maailman*. Although these texts were not presented in contrast to an English original, we can also notice that Manner has in these lines more fully preserved Shakespeare's three-verb structure ("melt / Thaw, and resolve") with her paralleling of two alliterating verbs, while Rossi makes do with only one verb, *ei sula* (not melt). Manner's verbs of dissolving and evaporation also create a more vivid image of Hamlet's flesh disappearing, not just turning into small drops.

The poetic qualities continue in Manner's more euphemistic vocabulary regarding suicide, as in the bolded section, where the alliterative and assonant *päättää päiviään* (literally: end one's days) contrasts with Rossi's *itsemurha*, which is the standard way of saying "suicide" in Finnish. This usage divided readers, with some thinking that such an ordinary word had no place in a Shakespeare translation. Manner also personalizes the idea of "weary," having in the underlined section Hamlet say *olen uupunut (*"I am exhausted"). The alliteration continues towards the end of the extract, with softer "m" sounds

(*meno maailman*, the ways of the world) before ending with the stronger punch on *turha, turha!* (useless, futile).

Towards the end of the extract, Rossi powerfully captures the feeling of Shakespeare's list of adjectives, "how weary, stale, flat and unprofitable / Seem to me…" though due to the nature of Finnish, Shakespeare's sharp one- and two-syllable words become more like the five-syllable word "unprofitable" closing the sequence (*ikäviä, tunkkaisia, / ahdistavia ja turhanpäiväisiä*), which makes the text feel rougher, with especially hard *t* alliteration on several words, including the angry *iljettävä* at the end, which can be translated literally as "disgusting." At the risk of simplifying things too much, we might say that in this extract Manner's Hamlet is almost playfully poetic, which the respondents preferred, while Rossi's is harsher, more bitter.

Interestingly the preference numbers changed slightly on the questions about seeing vs. reading: only 54% preferred to *see* Manner's text performed, with Rossi increasing his share to 40%, while the numbers stayed almost the same for *read*, with Manner at 54%, Rossi at 34% and "both" at 8%. Most respondents chose the same extract to be seen or read, though four choose to see Manner and read Rossi, and another four chose to see Rossi and read Manner, commenting that Manner had more captivating language, and interesting Finnish. Text 1, in short, seems evidence against shared expectancy norms, although admittedly most of the comments are rather impressionistic.

Let us turn next to Text 2, which comes towards the end of the soliloquy used in Text 1. Here reader preferences were reversed, with a narrow majority preferring Rossi's version (48% to 34%, with another 10% saying both were equally good, and a few expressing no opinion) for, in the words of one respondent, its more successful "balance of poetry and clarity." Manner's version, by contrast, was criticized for trying too hard to be poetic, leading to overuse of alliteration for example, and also, as we saw above regarding Rossi's text, of being at times too prosaic.

Text 2, end of soliloquy in Text 1

	B. (Manner)	A. (Rossi)
Within a month, /	**K**uu**k**ausi vain, **k**uun outo **k**ierto! / One month only, one strange revolution of the moon	**K**uu**k**auden **k**uluessa? Ehti naimisiin jo ennen / In a month? Managed to get married already before
Ere yet the salt of most unrighteous tears /	Näyteltyjen kyynelien suola / The salt of feigned tears	**k**uin hänen valheellisten **k**yyneltensä / her untruthful tears'

Had left the flushing in her galled eyes, /	kun vielä punaa uskotonta silmää, / when still the red of unfaithful eyes,	**k**irvelevä puna jäähtyi hänen silmissään. / stinging red cooled in her eyes
She married. O, most wicked speed, to post /	jo miehen ottaa, niin on kiire juosta / already took a husband, such is [her] hurry to run	Niin ketterästi syntisessä kiireessään / How nimbly in sinful hurry
With such dexterity to incestuous sheets! /	rutsaiseen vuoteeseen *veriveljen* kanssa! / to an incestuous bed with her blood brother!	hän kiiti saastaisten lakanoiden väliin! / she speeds between polluted sheets!
It is not nor it cannot come to good. /	Huono juttu, ei hyvä siitä seuraa. / A bad thing, no good can come of it.	Pahoin tehty, eikä siitä mitään hyvää seuraa. / From such a bad deed, no good can come.
But break my heart, for I must hold my tongue.	Vaan murru sydän; *lukittu on kieli*. But break heart; locked is [my] tongue	Vain minun sydämeni särkyy, sillä minun täytyy vaieta. Only my heart breaks, as I must be quiet.

This extract provides a rather good example of natural vs. stilted alliteration, which readers clearly reacted to. Because the Finnish word for "month" is *kuukausi*, literally *kuu* (moon) + *kausi* (phase), the translators start with /k/ alliteration, both of whom choose to augment it. Rossi does this with a much lighter hand, first asking a simple question, *Kuukauden kuluessa* ("In a month?"), before starting an elaborate and highly-successful chain of premodification with alliterative /*k*/ on the key words ***k****yyneltensä* ("tears") and ***k****irvelevä* ("stinging"). This image of *kirvelevä puna*, stinging redness in the eyes, was thought to work especially well, and its /k/ alliteration, continuing into the next lines emphasizing verbs and adverbs, was also seen as effective. By contrast, Manner's text was accused of working too hard for its alliteration, as in the first line, *kuun outo kierto* (literally: a strange revolution of the moon) was felt to be a bit repetitious and stilted. A similar problem with stilted alliteration was identified in ***v****eri****v****eli* (literally: blood brother), which several commented on as having the wrong connotations for this text.

Rossi was also praised for the poetic juxtaposition of *paha* (evil) in the phrase *pahoin tehty* and *hyvä* (good) in the other underlined section (literally: From such a bad deed, no good can come). Rossi's much more patterned and

eloquent formulation was especially contrasted with Manner's prosaic *huono juttu* (literally, "a bad thing," which comes straight from spoken language), which several respondents commented upon negatively. And while Manner was praised in the first excerpt for her creative syntactic inversions, in this excerpt some commented negatively on *lukittu on kieli* (literally, "locked is [my] tongue"), which was felt to be awkward. The gentle rocking rhythm of Rossi's solution, which ironically is about the closest he ever gets to iambic pentameter (his text is mostly trochaic), is in stark contrast to Manner's more uneven rhythm in the corresponding phrase.

One interesting criticism of Manner, which may be applicable to drama translations more broadly, is its unevenness of style: one respondent remarked that the style shifts from "festive poetic" in the first three lines, to "ugly and grotesque" in the fifth line, to "ordinary, everyday" in the sixth. These comments highlight the difficulties translators face as they negotiate the rather fine line between "too old and therefore not understandable" and "too modern and therefore not Shakespearean," or between poetic diction and more ordinary spoken language. As we have seen, even in a short extract the stylistic range can be broad, and neither of these translators stays consistently at either end of the stylistic extremes.

Again, most respondents preferred to see and read the same text, though this time two preferred to see Manner but read Rossi, whereas five preferred to see Rossi but read Manner. The explanation for this was that Manner was perceived as more difficult (in a good sense, more open to multiple interpretations), but that this does not matter when reading. Perhaps the main lesson of this example is that poetic devices, such as alliteration, must be done absolutely skilfully if not to seem forced, and stylistic consistency is also important.

For my third excerpt, I wanted to include something of Ophelia's speech, to see whether respondents sensed any differences based on the gender of the translator (one of whom is female and the other male). The only comment in this regard is one respondent who felt that the male translator's (Rossi's) Ophelia "sounds like a man speaking, not a young girl." A small majority preferred Manner, citing many of the same reasons they cited with Text 1, praising the text for its poetic language and compactness.

Text 3 Ophelia, 2.1.77-84

	A. (Manner)	B. (Rossi)
My lord, as I was sewing in my closet, /	Istuin huoneessani ja ompelin, / I was sitting in my room and sewing	Istuin huoneessani ompeluksen ääressä, / I was sitting in my room at my sewing,

Lord Hamlet, with his doublet all unbraced, /	kun prinssi Hamlet, *ihan suunniltaan*, / when Prince Hamlet, frantic	kun herra Hamlet astui sisään takki auki / when Mr. Hamlet came in, his jacket open
No hat upon his head, his stockings fouled, /	tukka sekaisena, sukat nilkoissa, / his hair a mess, socks at his ankles,	repsottaen, ilman hattua ja sukkanauhoja / dangling, without a hat or garter
Ungartered, and down-gyvèd to his ankle, /		ja törkyiset sukat makkaralla nilkoissa and filthy socks drooping around his ankles
Pale as his shirt, his knees knocking each other, /	törmäsi sisään ryömien polvillaan, /pushed his way in, crawling on his knees kalpeana kuin paita, vaikeroiden / as pale as a shirt, wailing	**k**uin **k**ahleet, **k**asvot **k**alpeina **k**uin paitansa / like chains, [his] face as pale as his shirt ja polvet tutisten ja näöltään surkeana/ and [his] knees trembling and looking awful
And with a look so piteous in purport /	[eliminated reference to "look"]	[eliminated reference to "look"]
As if he had been loosed out of hell /	kuin olisi helvetistä **k**arannut / as though escaped from hell	kuin helvetistä vapautettu sielu, as a soul let out of hell
To speak of horrors—he comes before me.	**k**ertomaan **k**adotetun **k**auhuista. to tell of hellish horrors	joka saapuu *kertoilemaan* kauhutarinoita. who comes to tell horror stories.

Just from the amount of text, it is clear that Manner has chosen to be especially concise with this speech, which eleven respondents commented on favourably, using adjectives like "compact" and "effective." As in the previous examples, respondents were sensitive to differences in tone, and especially inconsistencies between "older" and "more modern" language. In Manner's text,

ihan suunniltaan (beside himself, frantic) was thought to be too modern to work well with the delightfully poetic final phrase, with all of its *k* alliteration. Similarly, *kertoilla* (a form of the verb "to tell") in Rossi's version was thought to be too modern. Capturing nuances conveyed by terms of address in English is also remarkably difficult: Manner uses "prince Hamlet" but Rossi goes for alliteration on ***h**erra **H**amlet*, where *herra* literally means "Mr." The problem here, as several noticed, is that there is a children's book in Finnish with a similar-sounding name (*Herra Huu*). The underlined image in Rossi (literally: filthy socks drooping around his ankles) was felt by some to be bordering on farce. On the whole respondents seemed to like the shorter, freer version (46% to 34%), and also thought Manner's text was clear and easier to follow. Interestingly, this was the text which generated the most blank or "neither" answers, at 16%. As before, most preferred to see and read the same version, though here five preferred to see Manner and read Rossi, while three preferred to see Rossi and read Manner. Aside from the one comment, the gender of the translator or speaker did not seem significant.

No comparison of *Hamlet*s would be complete without considering the "to be or not to be" speech. Not surprisingly, this speech generated a lot of comment, as Rossi had decided to commit the sacrilege (in the minds of many respondents) of altering the "accepted" translation of the line (more on that below).

Text 4, Hamlet, 3.1.56-61

	B. (Manner)	A. (Rossi)
To be, or not to be— that is the question: /	Ollako vai eikö, siinä *pulma*. / To be or not? That is the problem.	Olla vai ei? Siitä on nyt *kyse*. Onko *ylevämpää* / To be or not? That is the question. Is it nobler?
Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer /	*Jalompaa* onko vaiti ottaa vastaan / Nobler is it to quietly accept	kärsiä vain sisimmässään / to suffer in your inner being
The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune /	pahansuovan onnen turmannuolet / the accidental arrows of malevolent fortune	julman onnen sinkoamat ammukset ja nuolet / the shots and arrows hurled by cruel fortune
Or to take arms against a sea of troubles /	vai aseella selvä tehdä murheistaan, / or with arms clear one's woes,	vai nousta taistelemaan vaikeuksiensa / or rise up to fight [one's] troubles

And by opposing end them.	lopettaa ne kerta kaikkiaan? / end them all at once?	tulvaa vastaan ja voittaa ne? / against the flood and defeat them?
To die, to sleep— /	Kuolla – nukkua vain, nukkua – ei muuta – To die – only sleep, sleep – nothing else	Kuolla, nukahtaa, ja siinä kaikki – To die, to fall asleep, and that is all--
No more…		

Manner's text is very close to the first translation done of the lines into Finnish (by Paavo Cajander in 1879) whereas Rossi tries out a new version, removing the particle *–ko* from the first words, changing *pulma* (problem, dilemma) to Shakespeare's English "question" (*kyse*), and *jalompaa* to *ylevämpää* (both mean "noble," with the second being a more exalted way of saying so). Respondents balked at the changes, by far preferring Manner's rendition (62% to 20%, with 18% saying both or not expressing a preference, a large number in itself). A few even commented that this version is different from the one which has been ensconced in the Finnish imagination: *ollako vai eikö olla*, which ironically is not used in any of the five printed translations, so it has in fact developed on its own outside of the play text.[8] Respondents said things like, "this is the one we are used to; it can't be changed" or that Manner's version is "familiar and safe" (which alliterates in Finnish, *tuttu ja turvallinen*). A few, by contrast, thought that Rossi's version was "fresh and new."

This extract also had the most wishing to see/read a different text, with five preferring to see Rossi and read Manner, and six preferring to see Manner and read Rossi. Older Finnish translations of Shakespeare cannot really be said to be "strong" in the sense that people would know them well enough to compare them with new and competing translations, but clearly for these few lines, this is not the case. Any translator of Shakespeare into a foreign language will have to make decisions about lines whose translations have found a place in the vernacular. As can be seen here, there are advantages and disadvantages to both solutions, and some people seem to have almost a visceral reaction to disturbances in the status quo.

Finally, I wanted to include one excerpt of a quick-tempo dialogue with repetition and word play, as these are not the easiest things for a translator to reproduce. Here I chose a few lines from the famous "closet scene," a dialogue between Hamlet and his mother. As before, Manner's text was felt to be a bit lighter, more compact, and poetic, whereas Rossi's text was praised for being more like modern spoken Finnish and hence easy to understand.

[8] See (Rissanen).

Text 5, Gertrude's closet, 3.4.10-17

	A. (Manner)	B. (Rossi)
G. Hamlet, thou hast thy father much offended.	G. Isääsi, Hamlet, kovin loukkasit. Your father, Hamlet, you have badly offended.	G. Hamlet, olet pahoin loukannut isääsi. Hamlet, you have badly offended your father.
H. Mother, you have my father much offended.	H. Isääni, äiti, kovin loukkasitte. My father, mother, you have badly offended.	H. Äiti, te loukkasitte pahoin minun isääni. Mother, you have badly offended my father.
G. Come, come, you answer with an idle tongue.	G. Sinulla, poika, on valheellinen **kieli**. You, son, have a lying tongue.	G. Älä viitsi puhua noin **kevyesti**. Come on, don't speak so lightly.
H. Go, go, you question with a wicked tongue.	H. Teillä, äiti, on paheellinen **mieli**. You, mother, have a wicked imagination.	H. Älkää te puhuko noin **ilkeästi**. Don't you speak so cruelly.
G. Why, how now, Hamlet?	G. Mutta Hamlet! But Hamlet!	G. Hamlet, mikä sinun on? Hamlet, what's the matter with you?
H. What's the matter now?	H. Mitä haluatte? What do you want?	H. Äiti, mikä teidän on? Mother, what's the matter with you?
G. Have you forgot me?	G. Minua etkö tunne? Do you not know me?	G. Oletko unohtanut kuka minä olen? Have you forgotten who I am?
H. No, by the rood, not so! You are the queen, your husband's brother's wife /	H. *Totta maar*. Olette kuningatar, puolisonne veljen vaimo ja — sen pahempi — minun äitini.	H. *Kautta ristin, en*: kuningatar, puolisonne veljen vaimo. Mutta minun äitini te olette, vaikka toivon, että ette olisi.
And (would it were not so) you are my mother.	Of course [by the Virgin] Mary. You are the queen, your husband's brother's wife and – what's worse – my mother.	By the cross, no: the queen, your husband's brother's wife. But my mother you are, even if I wish you weren't.

Respondents especially liked the shared rhymes in Manner (*kieli, mieli*, language/mind) as a means of translating Shakespeare's repetition. Interestingly, the *kevyesti/ilkeästi* rhyme did not generate comment, perhaps because it's not as pure as the first, and at four syllables feels a bit laboured. Rossi's text, nevertheless, was felt to be modern, more like normal spoken Finnish, e.g. in its normal word order at the beginning, whereas Manner starts with "father," the object of the clause. A similar inversion is found in the underlined section, *Minua etkö tunne*, with *minua* unusually placed in the first position, adding to the text's poetic qualities. Manner's text was thought to be sharper, more compact in an effective way, though one expression, *totta maar* was thought strange as it is a dialect word and very colloquial, out of keeping with the rest of the excerpt (though others liked this, saying it "suited Shakespeare translation"). Respondents tended to like both versions (46% preferred Manner, 26% liked both or expressed no preference, while 28% preferred Rossi). This was the only text where a clear majority of those who would prefer to see and read a different text chose to see Manner and read Rossi (only two in the other direction), thus suggesting that Manner's more playful and compact text was experienced as working better on stage.

So, what do we learn from these comparisons? Perhaps that there are no strong shared expectancy norms regarding Shakespeare translation, or at least these respondents preferred different sorts of texts. In this sample, Manner was generally thought to be more poetic, while Rossi more prosaic, but both had their admirers. Manner was generally thought to use "older" forms more successfully, but Rossi's more modern translations, with their frequent uses of spoken Finnish, were also preferred by some. "Rhythmic" was mentioned by many, though again readers disagreed on which extract they experienced as being more rhythmic. Manner was admired for her "compact" and "effective" texts and Rossi criticized for his "wordy" ones, but Rossi's translations were also thought to be "more interesting" since all those words require thought and interpretation. Interestingly, only one respondent consistently preferred Manner's texts, and only one Rossi's; most preferred some combination of one and the other. For translators, these results perhaps provide comfort in that you can never please everyone. Shakespeare scholars would do well to take variations in expectancy norms into account when assessing and analysing Shakespeare in translation.

WORKS CITED

Aaltonen, Sirkku. "Retranslation in the Finnish Theater." *Traducao, Retraducao e adaptacao* 1.11 (2003): 141-159.

Chesterman, Andrew. *Memes of Translation*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1997.

Chesterman, Andrew. "Norms of the Future?" Ian Kemble, ed. *Translation Norms: What is "Normal" in the Translation Profession?* Portsmouth: University of Portsmouth: School of Languages and Area Studies, 2005. 1-9.

Gallimore, Daniel. "Tsubouchi Shōyō and the Beauty of Shakespeare Translation in 1900s Japan." *Multicultural Shakespeare: Translation, Appropriation and Performance*. 13 (2016): 69-85.

Gallimore, Daniel. "Shakespeare's History Plays in Japan." Hoenselaars, Ton. *Shakespeare's History Plays: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. 92-107.

Hardwick, Lorna. "Playing Around Cultural Faultlines." Chantler, Carla Dente and Ashley. *Translation Practices: Through Language to Culture*. Amsterdam: Brill Academic Publishers, 2009. 167-183.

Huang, Alexander C. Y. "Shakespeare and Translation." Mark Thornton Burnett, Adrian Streete and Ramon Wray, eds. *Edinburgh Companion to Shakespeare and the Arts*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011. 68-87.

Johnston, David. "Metaphor and Metonymy: the Translator-Practitioner's Visibility." Roger Baines, Cristina Marinetti, and Manuela Pergeghella, eds. *Staging and Performing Translation: Text and Theater Practice*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. 11-30.

Keinänen, Nely. "Canons and Heroes: The Reception of the Complete Works Translation Project in Finland, 2002-13" *Multicultural Shakespeare*, volume 16.1 (2017): 109-125.

Koskinen, Kaisa and Outi Paloposki. *Sata Kirjaa, Tuhat Suomennosta: Kaunokirjallisuuden Uudelleenkääntäminen*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 2015.

Leppihalme, Ritva. "Foreignizing Strategies in Drama Translation." Andrew Chesterman, Natividad Gallardo San Salvador, Yves Gambier, eds. *Translation in Context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1998. 153-62.

Manner, Eeva-Liisa, translator. William Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. Helsinki: WSOY, 1998.

Martin, Alice. "Macbethista Hamletiin: Kymmenen Vuoden Oppismisprosessi" [From *Macbeth* to *Hamlet*: A Ten-Year Learning Process]. *Synteesi* 1-2/2016 (volume 35): 71-81.

Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies, 2nd edition*. London: Routledge, 2008.

Puurtinen, Tiina. "Two Translations in Comparison: A Study on Readability." Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja and Stephen Condit, eds. *Kielitieteellisiä Tutkimuksia, Studies in Languages*. Joensuu: University of Joensuu, 1989. 87-111.

Rissanen, Matti. Ollako vai eikö olla? Kenen käännös? Kas siinä pulma [To be or not to be? Whose Translation? That is the Question]. Helsinki: Research Unit for Variation, Contacts and Change in English (Varieng), University of Helsinki, 2013. electronic. <: https://variblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/20/ollako-vai-eiko-olla-kenen-kaannos-kas-siina-pulma/ >.

Rossi, Matti, translator. William Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. Helsinki: WSOY, 2013.

Ruokonen, Minna. “Target Readers' Expectations and Reality: Conformity or Conflict?” Pekka Kujamäki et al, eds. *Beyond Borders: Translations Moving Languages, Literatures and Culture*. Berlin: Frank & Tunne, 2011. 73-100.

Siponkoski, Nestori. *Translation under Negotiation: The Textual Interplay of Translators and Editors in Contemporary Finnish Shakespeare Translation*. Vaasa: University of Vaasa, 2014.

Venuti, Lawrence. “Retranslations: The Creation of Value.” *Bucknell Review* 47.1 (2004): 25-38.